

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 7, 14, 17, 20 and 21 have been amended as described below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the remarks that follow.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 1, 7, 14 and 20 have been amended to delete the term “PowerPoint®.” These claims have been additionally amended, along with claims 3, 17 and 21, to delete the abbreviation “PPT.” These amendments are merely intended to clarify the subject matter of the invention; none of these amendments narrows the scope of any claim. In view of these amendments, it is submitted that the § 112, second paragraph, rejection is overcome.

It will be further noted that the title has likewise been amended to delete “PowerPoint®.”

Turning now to the art rejections, all claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): claims 1-3, 14-17, 20 and 21 based on sections from a document identified in the current Office Action (OA) as “Syncomatic Online Documentation” (*Syncomatic*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,835 to *Lin*; claims 4, 5, 18 and 19 based on *Syncomatic* in view of *Lin* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,109 to *Silver et al.* (*Silver*); claims 6-10 based on *Syncomatic* in view of *Lin* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,210 to *de Queiroz et al.* (*de Queiroz*); and claims 11-13 based on *Syncomatic* in combination with *Lin*, *de Queiroz* and *Silver*.

These rejections are traversed on the grounds that the primary reference, *Syncomatic*, does not bear any reliable date and is therefore not a valid reference against this application. Alternatively, these rejections are traversed on the grounds that *Syncomatic*, taken in any combination with the other applied references, does not render the invention as claimed obvious.

Syncomatic is ostensibly directed to a program for converting slides in a PowerPoint file to a corresponding series of GIF images. See pages 3-5 of the section of *Syncomatic* identified as “Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000.” *Syncomatic* provides no teaching as to how this is done. Moreover, while a GIF image may be compressed, its native state is an uncompressed bit map. Thus,

there is no conversion of a presentation file into compressed single image files, e.g., JPEG files, or creating the latter from the former, as each of the claims of the presentation application recites. Moreover, with the *Syncomatic* process, if a GIF is encountered in the conversion process, it is apparently copied into the destination directory without conversion, since GIF is the destination format. See page 1 of the section of *Syncomatic* identified as “Sync-O-Matic Style Files.” This is markedly different from applicants’ claimed invention, which involves processing each presentation object, such as a GIF object, that is animated or to which an effect is applied, to generate the compressed image files.

The method of independent claim 1 recites this processing as generating first and second compressed single image format images, each capturing a presentation object in a first presentation slide, the first compressed single image format capturing the presentation object before an effect is applied and the second capturing an end-point of the effect applied to the presentation object. As per independent claim 7, the processing comprises determining whether each presentation object in each presentation slide has effects applied and whether each such object is an animated GIF object. For each animated GIF object, an image is rendered into an image buffer, and a JPEG image format file is then generated to show an end effect for any presentation object having effects applied. In independent program-instructions claim 14, instructions exist for determining whether the presentation object has presentation effects, generating a first compressed single image file showing the presentation object, and generating a second compressed single image file showing the presentation object having the effect applied. In independent integrated circuit chip claim 20 the processing noted above is described as logic for generating a first compressed single image file showing a presentation object without a presentation effect applied, and logic for generating a second compressed single image file showing an end effect of a presentation object having an effect applied. *Syncomatic* does not teach any of these claimed features, and none of the secondary references offsets this lack of teaching as explained below.

In rejecting each of independent claims 1, 14 and 20, the OA further relies on *Lin*, particularly for the claimed processing of a presentation object having an effect applied. *Lin* is directed to a technique for generating a movie file from slides

created with a presentation program. The file translation may be frame-based. The generated movie file may then be compressed according to a type of compression compatible with movie data, such as MPEG. MPEG frames, however, are not the same as compressed single images, such as JPEG images. Indeed, if such were the case, MPEG would be unnecessary. Among other differences, MPEG uses block-based motion compensated prediction, whereas JPEG does not; and JPEG is more general purpose than MPEG in terms of applicable color spaces. Moreover, considering that the destination formats between the claimed invention and *Lin* are different, there is no reason to believe that the processing would be the same. To distinguish between the output of the present invention and an output in MPEG form, claim 1 presently recites “compressed single image format,” and the phrase “compressed image file” in claims 14 and 20 has been amended to “compressed single image file” to more clearly emphasize this difference. The only other independent claim (claim 7) refers to a “JPEG image format file,” which is different from an MPEG output.

Regarding claim 7, the OA further relies on *de Queiroz* (in addition to *Syncomatic* and *Lin*) in rejecting that claim. *de Queiroz* is directed to processing compressed digital data, which is derived from a temporal sequence of image frames, each of which comprises a two-dimensional array of pixels. The compression may be in accordance with any number of standards including JPEG, MPEG and MJPEG, which are simply different compressed environments in which the processing of *de Queiroz* can be applied. Importantly, this patent contains no teaching regarding conversion of a presentation file, which is a relatively special format and which is also the starting point of applicants’ claimed invention. Accordingly, there is no basis for using *de Queiroz* to modify either *Syncomatic* or *Lin*, as the OA indicates.

In view of the foregoing analysis, applicants respectfully submit that none of *Syncomatic*, *Lin* or *de Queiroz*, whether considered individually or in any combination, teaches nor fairly suggests the claimed invention as recited in each of the independent claims. Moreover, *Silver*, which is cited against claims 4, 5, 18 and 19, shows the use of Roberts cross kernels as a gradient estimator in an edge detection process, but falls well short of remedying the deficiencies of the other three applied documents with respect to the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of the independent claims is patentably distinguishable over the cited documents for the reasons stated above. It is further submitted that each of the dependent claims, which adds one or more additional inventive features, is patentable for at least the same reasons as its independent claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Watson/

Mark P. Watson
Registration No. 31,448

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 952-6124
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: March 22, 2007